

Remarks

Pursuant to Examiner's notation with respect to claims 1, 20 and 54 to the effect that the upset portions of the bolt have not been positively claimed as a single-piece member nor that the upset portions are radially projecting formations of the bolt, such claims have been amended to recite a unitary bolt having threaded end portions and a pair of integral, radially upset portions spaced inwardly relative to the threaded end portions thereof. Although Applicant contends that a person having ordinary skill in the art would construe the language of a bolt having a pair of upset portions as being a unitary member with integrally formed upset portions, Applicant regards the additional modifying terms "unitary," "integral" and "radially" as superfluous and not having the effect of limitations with respect to the scope of the claims.

With respect to claims 28 through 39 claiming a grommet, the Examiner notes that a specific location of the washer insert relative to the groove and a flange portion is not claimed. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is invited to independent claims 28 and 32 claiming a grommet in which it is recited that the rigid washer insert is molded in the body of resilient material, disposed adjacent the groove of the body having an opening aligned with the bore in the body of resilient material. The preamble portions of such claims further have been amended to recite the bolt having a pair of integral, spaced radially upset portions, which onto one of such up portions the annular groove of such resilient body is allowed to be snap-fit.

It is submitted that the aforementioned amendments to the claims and the further citations of existing language in the claims overcome the Examiner's grounds of rejection of such claims and further render such claims as distinguishable and non-obvious over the patent to Hardy, Jr., et al and the other references of record, taken singularly or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, it respectfully is requested that the rejection of Applicant's claims be withdrawn, such claims be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. In the alternative, it further is requested that if the Examiner persists in his rejection of the claims, this amendment be entered so as to place the application in better condition for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter N. Lalos
Registration No. 19,789
STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, LLP
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036-5622

October 6, 2006
PNL:cb
202/785-0100